



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/548,401	09/26/2005	Hiroshi Morisaki	05126	7990
23338 7590 07/12/2010 DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD 1727 KING STREET SUITE 105 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1783				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/548,401

Applicant(s)

MORISAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1783

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

Any rejections and or objections, made in the previous Office Action, and not repeated below, are hereby withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the response dated June 15, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 4 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrases “cutting lines penetrating through the tape body and the release sheet in the same location”, “wherein a slit is formed between the positioning tab and the tape body so as to form an unconnected portion there between” and “wherein the unconnected portion is provided on a remaining portion of the end periphery of the tape body” in claim 1 are unclear, which renders the claim vague and indefinite. It is unclear from the claim language what the difference is between the cutting lines and the slits. Is the cutting line supposed to consist of slits, which would form perforations through the layers?

Claims 4 – 8 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraphs due to their dependency on the above rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 4 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2-353 U in view of Barbieri (USPN 4,004,362).

JP 2-353 U discloses an adhesive tape (Figures 1 – 4), comprising: a tape body to be adhered to an adherend (Figures 1 and 2, #24), a positioning tab positioned on one end periphery of the tape body (Figures 1 and 3, #26), and a release sheet provided on a rear side of the tape body (Figure 1, #28), wherein the positioning tab and the tape body are interconnected via connecting portions that are positioned there between, the connecting portions (Figures 4, #26) respectively further including a cutting lines penetrating through the tape body (Figure 2, #27) and the release sheet (Figure 3, the line separating #28A and 28B), wherein a slit is formed between the positioning tab and the tape body so as to form an unconnected portion therebetween (Figure 2, #27), wherein the connecting portions are provided on side portions of one end periphery of the tape body (Figure 4; Figure 3, #27), wherein the unconnected portion is provided on a remaining portion of the end periphery of the tape body (Figure 4; Figure 3, #27)

as in claim 1. With regard to claim 2, the positioning tab is positioned along one end periphery (Figures 4, #26), and wherein the connecting portion is partly provided on one end periphery so that the tab is separated from the tape body other than the connecting portion (Figures 4, #26). As in claim 3, the release sheet is provided on the entire area of the rear side of the tape body (Figure 1, #28), and wherein the release sheet has a slit that is formed adjacent to the connecting portion (Figure 3, #28A and 28B). Regarding claim 4, the release sheet has an additional slit that is formed in a side periphery thereof (Figure 3, #28A and 28B). With regard to claim 5, the release sheet extends onto a rear side of the positioning tab beyond the connecting portion (Figure 1, #28). As in claim 6, the positioning tab has a fixing element that is positioned adjacent to the connecting portion (Figure 4, #26). Regarding claim 7, the tape body comprises an elongated tape body (Figure 3, #24), wherein the one end periphery of the tape body corresponds to one of longitudinally opposed end peripheries of the tape body, and wherein the slit is formed so as to extend along one of the laterally opposed end peripheries of the tape body (Figure 3, #28A and 28B). With regard to claim 8, the adhesive tape is designed to be applied to a vertical frame of a vehicle door, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. However, JP 2-353 U fails to disclose a cutting line penetrating through the tape body and the release sheet in the same location, wherein the release sheet has slits that are respectively formed adjacent to the cutting lines so as to be peeled while leaving side peripheral portions thereof allowing only the central area to be peeled away and wherein the cutting line is arranged and constructed to be ruptured therealong, so that the positioning tab can be separated from the tape body along the cutting line.

Barbieri teaches a tape body to be adhered to an adherend (Figures 1 and 8, #11), and a release sheet provided on a rear side of the tape body (Figures 1 and 2, #13), wherein a cutting line penetrating through the tape body and the release sheet in the same location (Figure 1, #16; Figure 8, #28; Column 2, lines 42 – 44) for the purpose of protecting the adhesive while controlling the removal of the backing layer (Column 2, lines 60 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the cutting line penetrating through the tape body and the release sheet in the same location in JP 2-353 U in order to protect the adhesive while controlling the removal of the backing layer as taught by Barbieri.

With regard to the limitation of “wherein the cutting line is arranged and constructed to be ruptured therealong, so that the positioning tab can be separated from the tape body along the cutting line” in claim 1, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Since Barbieri teaches that the cutting line penetrating through the tape body and the release sheet in the same location (Figure 1, #16; Figure 8, #28; Column 2, lines 42 – 44) is a perforated line, it is capable of being ruptured and separated.

With regard to the limitation of “wherein the release sheet has slits that are respectively formed adjacent to the cutting lines so as to be peeled while leaving side peripheral portions thereof allowing only the central area to be peeled away”, JP 2-353 U disclose wherein the positioning tab and the tape body are interconnected via connecting portions that are positioned there between, the connecting portions (Figures 4, #26) respectively further including a cutting lines penetrating through the tape body (Figure 2, #27) and the release sheet (Figure 3, the line separating #28A and 28B). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the release sheet has slits that are respectively formed adjacent to the cutting lines so as to be peeled while leaving side peripheral portions, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. MPEP 2144.04.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4 – 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, since the same prior art is being used in the above rejections, the arguments will be responded to below.

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior does not teach connecting portions on the side portions of the end periphery of the tape and that the unconnected portion is provided on a remaining portion, please see the 112 2nd paragraph rejection above. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., connecting portions on both side portions of the

end periphery of the tape and that the unconnected portion is provided on a remaining portion) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571)272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Sample can be reached on (571) 272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1783

/Patricia L. Nordmeyer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1783